REMARKS

By this Response, Claim 4 has been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-12, 14-16, and 19-20 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Abstract

In response to the Examiner's comments, the Abstract has been amended as shown in the replacement Abstract. Approval of the replacement Abstract is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 9-12 and 19-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 9-12 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Alfred et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0187808) in view of *Prakash* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0143677), and still further in view of *Niki et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0037257). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of claims 1 and 11 are directed to receiving a set of data corresponding to a set of predetermined variables; determining a total cost estimate of one or more products using the set of data corresponding to the set of predetermined variables, and wherein the total cost estimate is based on determining a total material cost for one or more products; determining a difference in cost between products, and generating a cost differential report according to the estimated total cost for each product; and displaying the report, wherein the step of displaying the report further comprises generating a graphical representation of costs and savings for each product and generating a textual or numerical summary or report detailing cost differentials for each product.

It is the Examiner's position that *Alfred et al.* disclose the claimed invention with the exception of expressly disclosing using the set of data corresponding to the set of predetermined variables, and wherein the total cost estimate is based on determining a total material cost for one or more products. Accordingly, *Prakash* is applied as disclosing these features, referring to paragraph [0018] thereof. *Niki et al.* are applied as disclosing, in FIG. 11 thereof, an example of UI displayed on the personal computer of a purchaser upon accessing to discount information (FIG. 2), with representative displays pointed out in FIGS. 12 and 2.

-7-

To the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that *Alfred et al.* also fail to teach or suggest determining a difference in cost between products, and generating a cost differential report according to the estimated total cost for each product, referring to each of paragraphs [0016] and [0109] thereof. A reading of at least the referenced portions of Alfred et al. reveal that a markup may be applied to the cost of manufacturing the custom-processed product, the markup determined based on at least one of a plurality of markup factors (quantity requested, product type, product features) as described in paragraph [0016]. Further, in paragraph [0109] of Alfred et al., a combo pricing feature is described in which a quotation is generated for multiple similar products at once. When purchasing multiple products, the quantities of all products are <u>added together</u>. There is no disclosure in Alfred et al. directed to generating a <u>cost differential report</u> according to the estimated total cost for <u>each</u> product. A total sum of products purchased is not a cost <u>differential</u> for each product. In fact, from a sum, it will be impossible to determine cost of each product alone, let alone a differential between products. Further, because *Alfred et al.* do not generate a cost differential report for <u>each</u> product, the "display" thereof will not include generating a graphical representation of costs and savings <u>for each product</u> and generating a textual or numerical summary or report detailing cost differentials for each product as claimed.

The disclosures of *Prakash* and *Niki et al.* fail to overcome the deficiencies of *Alfred et al.* Without agreeing to the Examiner's characterization of either *Prakash* or *Niki et al.*, it is submitted that mere inclusion of cost of material, or utilizing a graphic representation is insufficient to disclose the generating a <u>cost differential report</u> according to the estimated total cost for <u>each</u> product or generating a graphical representation of costs and savings <u>for each product</u> and generating a textual or numerical summary or report detailing cost differentials for <u>each product</u> as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 9-12 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants further respectfully submit that remaining claims 2, 9, 10; and 12, 19-20 are in condition for allowance, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 11, respectively.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Alfred et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0187808) in view of *Prakash* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0143677), and still further in view of *Niki et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0037257), and further in view of *Musafia et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0038235). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is the Examiner's position that *Musafia et al.* disclose a hidden cost correction parameter. To the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that *Musafia et al.* fail to overcome the deficiencies of *Alfred et al.*, *Prakash* and *Niki et al.* as pointed out above.

Without agreeing as to the relevance of Musafia et al., it is further respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 14 are in condition for allowance, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 11, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references applied against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 50-2961.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-21-09

By: _____
Peter M. Reyes, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,020

CARGILL, INCORPORATED
P.O. Box 5624
Minneapolis, MN 55440-5624
Phone: (952) 742-5395
Facsimile: (952) 742-6349